LOGISYS
LOGISTIC SYSTEMS. INC

3000 Palmer St.
Missoula, MT 59808
Feb. 26, 2009

Ravalli County Commissioners
215 S. 4th Street, Suite A
Hamilton, MT 59840

Dear Mr. James Rokosch, Mr. Greg Chilcott, Mr. J.R. Iman, Ms. Kathleen Driscoll, and Ms. Carlotta Grandstaff:

We have thoroughly reviewed the list of issues forwarded by Marty Birkeneder. We appreciate the opportunity to correct the situation with Ravalli County, and we truly hope that we can work together to achieve a constructive relationship and a positive experience for the County.

Our response is structured as follows:

Section 1 – Overall assessment
Section 2 – Summary of the issues and categorization of response
Section 3 – Specific response to each of the issues reported
Section 4 – Next steps

Section 1 - Overall Assessment.
Upon receipt of the list of issues submitted by the various departments, LogiSYS visited Ravalli County to review the issues in detail and to confirm our understanding of each one. The individuals we met were cooperative, open to suggestions, and forthcoming with information. LogiSYS learned about some real issues with the software, which will require correction. However, from the LogiSYS perspective, the meetings lacked the interest and presence of individuals in a management position who could both make decisions and explain underlying procedural needs. While many of the topics were specific to the individual department submitting the issue, often larger, big picture issues arose. It was difficult to determine what criterion was being used to determine success or failure for the project. It seemed the success or failure was contingent on satisfying particular end users, not creating an overall usable product. We feel that a long-term relationship with Ravalli will depend on more than just making a small number of end users happy.

We understood Marty Birkeneder to be the representative assigned to work with LogiSYS for the resolution process. Therefore we specifically requested her presence but for unspecified reasons, she did not participate in either meeting. Had she or someone representing the County's interest attended the meetings, they would have heard users admit that they were never formally trained on the system, that they do not use important features built into the system, and that there is no clear definition of responsibility in terms of administering the system. We are not denying that there are issues that LogiSYS needs to address, however, we feel the overall lack in involvement on the part of Ravalli's management will continually result in dissatisfaction with the software. Some of the issues we found need long-term solutions and can only be resolved by Ravalli County.

Due to the seriousness of the meeting of Dec. 2 and the extreme dissatisfaction on the part of the Sheriff and others, we assumed a level of concern and cooperation from people who make decisions regarding priorities and even agency policy. This lack of involvement on the part of management is consistent with our initial implementation efforts. Here are some examples where we feel involvement from management is lacking:

- There is no policy in Dispatch that requires Dispatchers to utilize the recommendation function built into the CAD system. Instead, it is up to the discretion of the dispatcher to use the function or not. We confirmed with the dispatchers that the system-generated recommendations are working appropriately IF the policy was based on availability of the Officer. Dispatchers described the practice of sometimes routing based on availability and sometimes not routing based on availability. The policy is not consistent. Again, the individuals to whom we spoke about this issue are not responsible for policy, and it would have been better to work with someone who could work with us to find dispatch policies that could be incorporated into the system.

- All Patrol officers in Ravalli are assigned to the highest security level within the RMS system. This level of security is normally reserved for system administrators only. A user with this level of security can manipulate important data files and easily delete case elements. We have gone to great lengths to insure a secure data environment for public safety entities throughout the US. Allowing the highest level of access to all officers does not take advantage of this feature and it certainly does not seem to be in Ravalli County's best interest to allow anyone to remove files as they seem fit.

- At least 3 individuals have been trained on the System Administration functions for the Records Management System (RMS) and 5 on the Computer-Automated Dispatch System. However, after our meetings, we found that it is not clearly defined as to who is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the system. The IT department seems to have taken on IT-related tasks such as hardware, system upgrades, network-related issues and daily backups, but the administration of data files and responsibility for report generation is not clear to LogiSYS or to many of the end users with whom we met.

- All of the current users in Data Entry are new since the Records Management System went live in Ravalli, and therefore no one formally trained by LogiSYS remains. All current staff received training from a previous employee and were extremely vocal to us about the training being insufficient. It is unclear to us if this issue was ever brought to the attention of someone in a management position at the County. Data Entry clerks admitted they were never given any of the LogiSYS training manuals that could have been used as a reference. (We since have provided Penny Montero with a CD of the User Training Manual.)

- WORKFLOW is a basic feature of our system that generates a TO DO LIST for each officer based on the cases assigned to him and his position/responsibilities within the organization. One of the issues submitted to us in December 2008, was that there was no listing of outstanding cases available to the Patrol officers. When we received the complaint, we immediately questioned if WORKFLOW initially established for Ravalli was still operational. We determined it was, in effect, turned off. WORKFLOW is a desired feature of our system. It is configurable to fit most agencies' internal processes. Had we known it was not working to the expectations of Ravalli, we would expect to be able to work with someone from Patrol on how it could be setup and useful for Ravalli. Instead, the decision was made to circumvent the process without notifying LogiSYS. Attempts to address this during our most recent visit were unsuccessful as the Officer assigned to come to our meeting was extremely rushed and in fact could not even take the time to sit down to discuss the problem in more detail.

We feel that many of the above issues contribute to the long-term dissatisfaction with the system. We hope that we are given the opportunity to not only correct the specific issues on the list submitted by your users, but to also work with Ravalli on addressing these larger issue and thereby making the LogiSYS software a valuable tool for Ravalli County.

At our meeting of Dec. 2, Ravalli referenced discussions about being a show site for LogiSYS. Our perception of a show site is a partnership between LogiSYS and a client, working together for the benefit of both organizations. Commitment is a critical component to this relationship. On the part of LogiSYS, we need to be committed to improving our software and receptive to the ideas of the agency. A client would need to be committed to utilizing all key functions available in the system. Both parties would need to work together to insure the system is configured in compliance with known policy decisions. The partnership would require LogiSYS to react to the needs of the agency, and the agency would need to be willing to upgrade the software frequently and provide constructive feedback to LogiSYS. Effective communication with each other and within each organization would need to be a priority for both parties. This has not been our experience with Ravalli to date. If that should change in the future, we would be more than happy to work towards this kind of relationship. We are quite proud of both our product lines and our Montana heritage and having a neighboring County as our client is very important to us.

Section 4 of this response requests a meeting between LogiSYS Management Staff and representatives of management for Ravalli County. Naturally we do not expect to cover the specific details regarding user functions or reported bugs with this audience, but we would like to discuss subjects such as ongoing training, policies on use of key functions, and system administration responsibilities.

Section 2 - Categorization of responses	# in Category	Reference # Wants/Warrant="WW", Patrol ="P", DataEntry = "DE", Dispatch ="D"
Enhancement	**12**	
In this category are items that LogiSYS agrees to handle with a system enhancement. As part of our License and Maintenance agreement, LogiSYS continues to enhance the system in response to feedback from our clients. We will work with Ravalli and other sites in the specific design of these enhancements. Some of the items in this category are enhancements that were already available, some are in progress and some are items that are new and will need detailed analysis regarding design.		WW1, WW2(available now), WW4, WW5, WW8(available), WW9, WW11, WW12(available), D4, D9, D14 D16
Corrected	**10**	
The items in this category have been corrected either immediately upon learning of the issue, or since our meeting with users on site. Many of these issue were standard Support issues that needed only to be reported to the appropriate staff.		WW10, D1, D2, D3, D5, D7, D8, D10, D11, D13
Training	**7**	
We found that this issue was reported because the user was unfamiliar with how to use a particular function of the system.		WW3, WW6, WW7, WW13a, WW14, WW15, DE1
Closed by Ravalli	**4**	
This category includes issues that 1.) Ravalli either removed from the list, 2.) we could not find anyone who could provide further details, 3.) were resolved by Ravalli and not LogiSYS' related issues.		P1, P2, D6, D12
Incorrect use of system	**1**	
This category represents incorrect use of the system that were interpreted as LogiSYS related issues.		DE2
Not a function of the system	**1**	
This category includes items reported as issues, but refers to functionality that is not part of the system.		WW13b
BUG - Outstanding	**1**	
This includes issues that were determined to be bugs and were still pending at the time of our response		D15
Total	**36**	

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
Ravalli CAD and RMS issues - This includes issues from Wants/Warrants/Civil Processing, Data Entry, Patrol and Dispatch			
WANTS/WARRANTS CIVIL PROCESSING (WW)			Response
WW1. When viewing alerts, from master name, alert type should be a field, especially in instances of multiple alerts; happens MULTIPLE times daily; requires extra time and work on her part to circumvent issue.	RMS	Enhancement	After discussion with Carla in Wants/Warrants/Civil Processing, we understand and agree why this is a valuable enhancement to the system. The enhancement will be documented and reviewed with other sites who utilize this module. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.
WW2. In Master Name Involvements, there should be "Civil" under involvement type; becomes an issue multiple times every day; requires extra time and work to circumvent issue.	RMS	Enhancement	This enhancement was the result of a discussion with Carla Larson from Ravalli County in April of 2008. It was released in version 4.3.15. Ravalli needs to upgrade to the latest version of the software to receive this functionality.
WW3. There should be an alert type called "No Contact Order"; is an issue multiple times each day; requires extra time and work to circumvent issue.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	While on site to review these issues, LogiSYS demonstrated that this alert type was already part of the system and Ravalli confirmed "No Contact Order" is listed on the dropdown menu.
WW4. Alerts should be editable, but as it stands to correct them they must be cancelled completely and re-entered; is an issue multiple times daily; requires a lot of extra work and time to circumvent issue.	RMS	Enhancement	This enhancement is currently in progress. This was done as part of a larger effort to make Alerts more functional. Feedback received from Ravalli was incorporated into this project as well as input from other clients.
WW5. When printing a Master Name Report, the entire name, as entered on the Master Name record should print, not just the middle initial, as it now does. Multiple times daily; requires much extra research time to confirm similar records are not confused with one in question.	RMS	Enhancement	After reviewing this issue we agree that it would be a valuable enhancement. We have already submitted to programmers who will correct for an upcoming release of the software. This enhancement will be given to clients as part of the License and Maintenance agreement.
WW6. We need to be able to print records such as active warrants, protection orders, conditions of release, no contact orders, probation/parole, etc.; is an issue daily, multiple times; requires reconstruction of lists by hand for printing; when entering warrants the system creates an alias where none should appear.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	We believe this is strictly a reporting issue that could be addressed by Standard Reports and AdHoc Reporting. Standard Reports was demonstrated to Carla Larson while LogiSYS was on site in early January. AdHoc Reporting was provided as part of the LogiSYS software. To demonstrate how this tool could have been used to address this issue, LogiSYS will agree to generate the reports discussed with Carla Larson during our meeting. However, LogiSYS suggests that Ravalli evaluate who should be given this functionality and follow up with applicable training for those individuals.
WW7. Civil Process should not be "lumped in" with Wants and Warrants, nor should Protection Orders; issue multiple times daily; takes a lot of time and effort to sort out these records and a parallel database to track them. Distinguishing these types of data would enable us to clean up database and eliminate the need for the civil division to maintain parallel databases to function quasi-efficiently.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	Upon further discussion with Ravalli we learned that the separate databases are necessary for reporting purposes. We believe the need for the additional databases would be eliminated had someone in Ravalli, such as a System Administrator been responsible for creating reports needed by the various end users in Ravalli. The AdHoc Reporting tool is provided as part of the LogiSYS software and at least three individuals were trained on the software at the time Ravalli went live. To demonstrate how this tool could have been used to address this issue, LogiSYS will agree to generate the reports discussed with Carla Larson during our meeting. However, LogiSYS suggests that Ravalli evaluate who should be given this functionality and follow up with applicable training for those individuals.

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
WW8. In Wants/Warrants,. If you validate the served person, it activates the view master button, but only for the first name entered, and if multiple people need to be served, the additional names show up as aliases of the first person entered rather than additional persons to be served; so we must enter names in the served person field, but not validate them and then enter them in the "Plaintiff" field as defendants to validate them and then add them to the Master Name records - - this is ridiculously time-consuming and confusing.	RMS	Enhancement	We recommend that the Civil Processing manager utilizes new functionality called Related Records demonstrated on Feb 11, 2009. Ravalli will need to upgrade to the current version of RMS get the Related Records functionality. This was an enhancement, which was completed prior to our meeting with the Commissioners, is the result of feedback from Clients using the Wants and Warrants Module. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.
WW9. For Concealed weapons permits, sex offender registrations, the alert type should show what type of alert it is not "SYS GEN" as it now appears; every record entered; multiple times daily; demands extra time and confusion.	RMS	Enhancement	This issue would be addressed together with the related issue #1.
WW10. Can't tab to the bail field from Wants/Warrants; multiple times, daily; demands extra time and generates frustration.	RMS	Corrected	This is a Support related issue that is easily resolved if reported to Support by your System Administer.
WW11. We are unable to search the CFS (Calls for Service) records by name of caller or suspect; multiple times daily; requires much extra time for unnecessary research where this information should be readily available by simple query.	RMS	Enhancement	After discussion with Carla Larson, we understand and agree why this is a valuable enhancement to the system. The enhancement will be documented and reviewed with other sites who utilize this module. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.
WW12. Should be able to track all docket-related civil in one tag and log continuing warrants, multiple services, levies, sheriff's sales; adds much research time, daily; frustrating.	RMS	Enhancement	We recommend that the Civil Processing manager utilizes new functionality called Related Records demonstrated on Feb 11, 2009. We anticipate that this new functionality may minimize, if not eliminate this issue. Ravalli will need to upgrade to the current version of RMS get the Related Records functionality.
WW13a.This issue is further broken down into two issues, 13A and 13B. m13A. -If we actually could run reports by docket number, or NCIC number, we would not need to keep all the separate parallel databases we use now to track CCW, Warrants, Civil, Protection Orders, all of which more than DOUBLE our work at this time.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	We understand this issue to be the needs for reports. This issue could have been resolved by a designated System Administrator by using AdHoc Reporting functionality that was provided as part of the LogiSYS software. To demonstrate how AdHoc could be used to address this issue, LogiSYS will agree to generate the reports discussed with Carla Larson during our meeting. However, LogiSYS suggests that Ravalli evaluate who should be given this functionality and follow up with applicable training for those individuals.
WW13B. Tracking of Civil Fees is also a requirement that necessitates Ravalli to use the separate database.		Not a current function of the system.	LogiSYS is developing a Billing Module that is not yet release. Ravalli is welcome to evaluate Billing and to purchase if you find it resolves this issue.

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
WW14. Essentially this database system does not meet our needs in the warrants and civil division; we have to maintain separate databases for research and tracking functionality, civil fees, active warrants, protection order lists, in addition to having to enter the information into the LogiSYS database, demanding duplicated, additional work. This process is cumbersome, difficult to use and search with. There are sub-tables that cannot be used, or lack the fields necessary to make them suit our needs, on of the biggest problems being that Wants and Warrants and Civil are combined and absolutely should not be combined, and protection orders should not be combined with other types of documents. We need to be able to print report, run queries, and generate service documents for the courts.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	We understand this issue to be the needs for reports. This issue could have been resolved by a designated System Administrator by using AdHoc Reporting functionality that was provided as part of the LogiSYS software. To demonstrate how this tool could have been used to address this issue, LogiSYS will agree to generate the reports discussed with Carla Larson during our meeting (See AdHoc Reporting). However, LogiSYS suggests that Ravalli evaluate who should be given this functionality and follow up with applicable training for those individuals. (See Training)
WW15. In April of 2008 I met personally with several LogiSYS techs, voiced the above concerns, and have NEVER had subsequent contact from them regarding how they plan to make this system work for me. I also sent an email to them regarding the documents they promised they could generate for our service purposes, and invoices for civil process showing the fee.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	The meeting in April was initiated by LogiSYS based on Carla Lawson's reaction to pending changes to the WWCP module. At that time, we invited Carla to Missoula to meet with a representative from the RMS Operations and Documentation. It was explained that we were interested in how Ravalli utilized the module and get a better understanding of the issues. We also indicated that at that particular time we where not planning major enhancements but that her input would be taken into consideration for long term planning. We feel the meeting was beneficial to both parties. We learned how the software is used in the real world, and Carla learned the existance of some reporting functionality that existed in the system but to which she was not given access or had received training. Access to AdHoc is a decision that is made by the County and follow through with the Agency's Sys Admin to request access and training would have been an appropriate step for Carla at that time.
PATROL			
P1. They would like a way to pull up a list comprising all pending cases that have not been submitted to their supervisors as "finished" and ready for review;	RMS	Closed by Ravalli	We had little time to visit with any representatives from Patrol who originally submitted this issue and then closed it. During the short conversation, we learned the issue is closed because Officers don't like the TO DO LIST functionality and therefore, don't use it. This TODOLIST function was originally set up in Ravalli and was since circumvented without LogiSYS input. It is unclear to us if this is a policy decision of the Sheriff's office or the decision of the individual we spoke with. We feel this is a important feature of the system and configurable to fit most workflow processes. We would like to be able to work with Patrol to learn the issues and re-establish this functionality. It would require working with specific individuals authorized to make policy decisions for the agency. Without utilization of this functionality, Ravalli could never be used as a demonstration site.

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
P2. I am hearing that the system is "usable" however they find the twice-daily shut-down very disruptive to their processes. I don't know if there is anything that can be done about that one, as someone will be inconvenienced no matter what time or how often the updates are done from your end.	RMS	Closed by Ravalli	Upon receipt of this issue we immediate emailed to obtain more information on this issue as we know of no reason (except for running daily backups) when the RMS system would be unavailable. During our two visits on site we asked 5 or 6 people for more details, but no one could provide any additional information.
DATA ENTRY (DE)			
DE1. The major problem we in Data Entry are having with Logisys is it is not very user friendly. We have problems getting cases to NIBRS. I'm not sure if it stems from our training as our format seems to be a little different from other Logisys users.	RMS	Training needed on existing functionality	Personnel handling Data Entry at Ravalli were hired since the implementation of RMS. Internal training was not adequate. Since the submission of this response, a 1/2 day NIBRS training class was held in Missoula and was attended by Ravalli. Ravalli indicated on their Training Evaluation forms that the training was extremely helpful. This training was initiated by LogiSYS and only addressed NIBRS. We recommend that Ravalli review the knowledge base of the staff currently using the system and evaluate training needs.
DE 2. We also have problems getting items added to or deleted from Logisys. Joe would have more information on these procedures. An example of this is adding MCAs to our code list.	RMS	Incorrect use of system -	During our visit to Ravalli to further investigate reported issues, we witnessed that invalid changes had been made to NIBRS related validation tables. LogiSYS is reviewing Ravalli's current NIBRS related table values to the approved NIBRS related values to determine inconsistencies. Specific changes to the Case Clearance field have already been corrected. Additional corrections will be made once the list of invalid values is identified. Ravalli need to assign someone to the role of System Administrator who will prevent invalid values from being entered into the system.
DISPATCH (D)			
D1. To be able to run a drivers license and registration for a traffic stop, using the traffic stop screen, you have to open the traffic stop from the command line and enter the officers badge number twice. If we don't do this, we don't get a return, be	CAD	Corrected	During a previous upgrade the wrong traffic screen was put in place at Ravalli. This was an set-up error on the part of Support. Once we learned about the issue, it was easily fixed. We don't know if dispatch had reported this problem prior to now, but we didn't find any record of a Support Call in our online support tracking system. This is an example of the necessity to improve communication on both sides
D2. When in the online phone information, you still need to select the off for case sensitive. It still doesn't default to "off" even though we asked for this to be changed for us.	CAD	Corrected	This was an enhancement released in CAD 4.4. As of the creation of the list by Dispatch, Ravalli had not been upgraded to this latest version. The option to set case sensitivity has since been set to "off" as desired by Ravalli.
D3. On the 4th station, you often have to restart CAD because it will either not open the resource manager or the dispatcher queue.	CAD	Corrected	As of 2/24, we understand that this issue is corrected. Support made some configuration changes to that particular station and then tested to make sure the resource manager and the dispatcher queue opened correctly. We asked for confirmation from Ravalli Dispatch on 2/23.
D4. RMS ISSUE FROM DISPATCH: Information entered into a CFS by dispatch can be seen in geninfo, but not RMS. We don't know why, but because it is this way, we have to switch back and forth between CAD and RMS constantly to check for any criminal history	RMS	Enhancement	We agree that the "CFS Find" inquiry should be enhanced to be able to find names and vehicles that were entered into a CFS. The enhancement will be documented and reviewed with other sites who utilize this module. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
D5. The system still does not save the CAD screen arrangements for each dispatcher, like we were told it would. They have to be arranged the way the dispatcher wants them, every single shift when they log on.	CAD	Corrected	As of 2/23, we understand this issue to be resolved. There have been no new report of this occurring since Feb 18.
D6. Still unable to print from CAD to the staffroom printer and I.T. staff are unable to figure out why we can't.	CAD	Closed by Ravalli	Confirmed fixed. When new server was put in place by Ravalli's IT department, the staffroom printer was not installed. LogiSYS followed up with Ravalli IT and it is now it is installed and working. This is an issue unrelated to LogiSYS.
D7. The "start query" from the officer stop screen is still not working, and hasn't since the 4.3 upgrade. The requester field for queriesdisappeared at that time and is a requirement of CJIN/NCIC.	CAD	Corrected	Resolution to this issue is the same as #1. At the time of the last upgrade a setup error was made by LogiSYS Support.
D8. When opening up the online phone information, the screen does not fully open. You have to drag it to the bottom of the screen and then fully open. You have to drag it to the bottom of the screen and then pull it back up to get it to open. This used	CAD	Corrected	This issue was resolved by an upgrade of Xserver (3rd party software embedded into CAD).
D9. Still unable to add additional people to an archived CFS. It would be great if the officers always added them from their end, but that doesn't happen. This could be an officer safety issue if the additional person that can't be added has a violent history.	CAD	Enhancement	Although this was never an option of the CAD system it has been requested as a enhancement from our User Group. Therefore it is currently under analysis as to how we can move ahead on this enhancement. LogiSYS will work with all current Clients to define this enhancement. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.
D10. Still do not always get a timely response from CAD support when we call them	CAD	Corrected	Joe Froehlich and Joanna Hamilton both confirmed that the CAD Support person currently assigned to Ravalli is polite and efficient and that currently this is not an issue. LogiSYS Management will continue to monitor the relationship between Support and Ravalli County.
D11. CAD support can still get somewhat testy with us at times, especially if they are attempting to get information and we don't understand what they are saying to us.	CAD	Corrected	Joe Froehlich and Joanna Hamilton both confirmed that the CAD Support person currently assigned to Ravalli is polite and efficient and that currently this is not an issue. LogiSYS Management will continue to monitor the relationship between Support and Ravalli County.
D12. We keep losing information from the online phone information list. It is constantly being updated, but the info somehow is not able to be accessed by dispatch and so they keep submitting requests for it to be updated.	CAD	Closed by Ravalli	While investigating this issue, we learned that Ravalli had lost this information at one time and had to revert back to a backup file that was relatively old. Our discussion with Joanna and Joe indicated that the missing information was a result of that incident. Both Joe and Joanna indicated that they will track this issue to see if there is new information being lost.
D13. RMS ISSUE FROM DISPATCH RMS history on a queried subject will still show a warrant that is no longer active, as active and yet there is no alert showing up for the warrant.	RMS	Corrected	The script designed to update the status on the Find screen was not running correctly. This has since been corrected. Confirmed corrected by Carla Larson and Joanna Hamilton on 2/17.

Section 3 - Issues	System	Category	Description
D14. RMS ISSUE RMS DISPATCH Still unable to access ambulance or fire calls by DR number in RMS. You have to query them in CAD and then get the CFS number to be able to query them in RMS. Very time consuming and ineffective use of time.	RMS	Enhancement	This issue involves inquiries in RMS for agencies not using RMS(such as fire and ems). It is possible to set up the system to allow for the CAD Dispatchers to inquire on DR# for all agencies. However due to the fact that all Officers in RMS are set up as System Administrators (highly NOT recommended) all Officers would be negatively impacted. We recommend Ravalli appropriately assign Officers to a user type other than System Administrators. Then LogiSYS will set up the fire and ems agencies and provide Dispatchers to inquire by DR#. We feel this actions above can be handled in a relatively short time period. In addtion, LogiSYS agrees that a longer term solution would also be beneficial and we have taken steps toward designing a longterm solution.
D15. The person screen does not immediately allow you to select the type of person at the top of the person entry screen. you have to select something else on the screen and then go back to the type.	CAD	Bug 221073	This bug is related to 3rd party software embedded into our CAD application. This bug has been reported to the 3rd party vendor and will be ...
D16. You still have to open a person entry screen for each person you need to enter into a CFS. You cannot use the same person entry screen for each entry.	CAD	Enhancement	This is an enhancement request that also came through the LogiSYS User Group. Therefore it is currently under analysis as to how we can move ahead on this enhancement. LogiSYS will work with all current Clients to define this enhancement. This enhancement will be offered to clients as part of License and Maintenance.

Section 4 – Next Steps

We want to make it clear that retaining you as a client, is very important to LogiSYS. We regret the present situation and want to repair our relationship.

Of the thirty-six issues brought to our attention, ten issues have already been corrected. We consider twelve of the issues to be enhancements to the system. Three of the twelve are enhancements that had already been in the works and will be available to Ravalli as soon as they upgrade to the current version of RMS. Some of the remaining nine enhancements will take some time to design and to review with clients, as it will change existing functionality. There will be no additional cost for the twelve enhancements, as all will be covered under License and Maintenance fees. Of the thirty-six issues, only one remains a bug at this time and one is considered to be outside the scope of the application. We hope you agree that the response to the issues reported, as a whole, is a positive one.

I'd like to call special attention to the issues submitted by Carla Larson on the Want Warrants/Civil Processing (WWCP) module. We agree the need to use a parallel system for reporting purposes is terribly inefficient. Our response to the WWCP issues in Section 2 is a mixture of enhancements already available, one-time LogiSYS created AdHoc reports based on Carla's requirements, and some long-term enhancements that will take some time to design and involve input from other clients. Carla has provided us with valuable information, and we hope that the resolutions provided in Section 2 are utilized and that there is a commitment on the part of Ravalli to continue using this module, as without it, we would most likely not begin on the long term enhancements.

As mentioned earlier however, we are not confident that the above changes will by themselves repair the relationship with Ravalli. Although some of the suggestions made by Ravalli are good suggestions, we feel that this exercise did not address the big picture. We fear that it is only a matter of time until we find ourselves back in a similar position. As with all organizations, Ravalli and LogiSYS will continue to experience turnover of key personnel. We feel both organizations need to improve the way we work together so our relationship can be productive despite these inconvenient realities. We feel that the best way to do so is through a series of meetings. Charlie Stortz and I, representing management of LogiSYS, would like to meet with representatives from Ravalli who are in a position of overall management for the County. We request that the Commissioners also provide a representative.

We hope these meetings are possible and will work with Ravalli to insure the interests of both organizations are addressed. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Steve Hoover
President
Logistic Systems, Inc.